

REMARKS

Claims 8-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7, and 17-19 have been canceled in this amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Portuesi (USP 5,987,509). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Portuesi discloses “a communication unit receiving a command from an external apparatus requesting for the video associated data, and transmitting the video associated data to the external apparatus to be displayed on the external apparatus (Fig. 5, element 52 transmits information that element 56 requests; Element 56 then displays the information o element 70).

In other words, the Examiner is asserting that the element 56 corresponds to the “external apparatus” of the claimed invention, and the element 52 corresponds to the “communication unit” of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 8 of the present application is directed the broadcast receiver shown, for example, in Fig. 11. The broadcast receiver includes a separation unit 201; a memory 203; a display unit 202, and a communication unit 205. The remote controller 103’ shown in Fig. 12 corresponds to the “external apparatus” recited in claim 8.

Claim 8 requires that the communication unit receives a command from an external apparatus requesting for the video associated data, and the communication unit transmits the video associated data to the external apparatus to be displayed on the external apparatus.

In Portuesi, however, the encoding system 52 (i.e., the element 52 which, according to the Examiner, corresponds to the “external apparatus”) merely outputs video signals with encoded URLs and does not request “for the video associated data,” as required in claim 8. In other words, the encoding system 52 merely corresponds to the broadcast apparatus 101, shown in Fig. 1 of the present application, that superposes video associated data and video associated button linked with video associated data on a video signal. Further, the decoding system 56 (i.e., the element 56 which, according to the Examiner, corresponds to the “communication unit”) merely decodes received video signals with encoded URLs and displays the decoded video with embedded URLs on a display 70. Therefore, the decoding system 56 does not transmit “the video associated data to the external apparatus to be displayed on the external apparatus,” as required in claim 8.

Accordingly, Portuesi fails to disclose or suggest the “communication unit” as recited in claim 8.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 17, 18, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Blackketter et al. (USP 6,415,438). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, 17, 18, and 19 have been canceled.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

(Independent Claim 12)

Claim 12 is directed to a remote controller that includes a communication unit receiving data and an image from an external apparatus, and transmitting electronic mail to the external apparatus, the external apparatus being provided independently from the remote controller and having a separation unit separating, from a broadcast wave, video as a source of the image, video associated data, and button data linked with the video associated data, and a memory that accumulates the separated button data (*emphasis added*).

With regard to claim 12, the Examiner states, in the Office Action, that “Portuesi discloses a communication unit receiving data and an image from an external apparatus, the external apparatus having a separation unit separating, from a broadcast wave, video as a source of the image, video associated data, and button data linked with the video associated data (fig 5, element 68; column 19, lines 35-58; column 6, lines 30-42). In other words, the Examiner is alleging that the decoding system 56 of Portuesi, which has a URL decode unit 68, corresponds to the “external apparatus” recited in claim 12.

Applicants respectfully submit that the “remote controller” of the claimed invention of the present application corresponds, for example, to the remote controller 103’ shown in Figs. 12 and 13 of the present application. The remote controller 103’ is provided with a communication unit 301, a memory 302, a display unit 303, a select unit 304, and a button data retrieval unit 305.

The “external apparatus” recited in claim 12 corresponds, for example, to the broadcast receiver 102’ shown in Fig. 11, which includes a separation unit 201 for separating, from a broadcast wave, video as a source of the image, video associated data, and button data linked

with the video associated data. As clearly shown in Figs. 11-13, the “external apparatus” is provided independently from the remote controller, as required in claim 12.

Therefore, based on the Examiner’s interpretation of Portuesi that the decoding system 56 corresponds to the “external apparatus” of claim 12, Portuesi does not have an element that corresponds to the “remote controller” of the present invention, which is provided independently from the decoding system 56 and includes a communication unit, a memory, a display unit, a select unit, and a button data, as required in claim 12.

The Examiner relies on Blackketter to show a unit wherein a button is selected by a user from the memory among the accumulated button data.

Applicants submit, however, that even assuming that Portuesi and Blackketter can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, one of ordinary skill in the art would not conceive the “remote controller” as recited in claim 12.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 10, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Narayan et al. (USP 6,859,937) in further view of Blackketter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(Independent Claim 10)

Claim 10 is directed to a broadcast receiver apparatus having a separation unit, a memory, a display unit, a first communication unit, and second communication unit.

The first communication unit receives an electronic mail from an external apparatus. More specifically, as shown in Figs. 11 and 13, the infrared receive/emissive unit 205

(corresponds to the “first communication unit”) receives the electronic mail generated by a mail production unit 307 of a remote controller 103’ (corresponds to the “external apparatus”).

The Examiner acknowledges in the Office Action that Portuesi does not specifically disclose receiving an electronic mail from the external device. Therefore, the Examiner relies on Narayan that, according to the Examiner, teaches an email function and button as shown in Fig. 4. The Examiner also relies on Blackketter to show a unit wherein a button is selected by a user from the memory among the accumulated button data.

Narayan, however, merely discloses, in Fig. 4, an email button 104 displayed on an option panel shown on a screen display.

Therefore, Portuesi in view of Narayan discloses, at best, a decoding system 56 having a URL decode unit 68, a display 70 which shows a URL window 30 or a hotspot 40, a user input device 14, and an email button 104 shown on the display 70. By triggering the email button 104, the display switches to a screen that allows the user to enter a password or personal identification number and then to a screen that allows the user to perform typical e-mail functions (see col. 6, lines 43-52). Accordingly, even assuming that the user input device 14 corresponds to the “external apparatus” of the claimed invention, the user input device 14 would merely function as a tool for triggering the email button 104 and for entering password and typing e-mail because it does not have “a mail production unit for producing the electronic mail,” as required in claim 10.

Claim 11, dependent on claim 10, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 10.

(Independent Claim 13)

Claim 13 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 12. More specifically, claim 13 is allowable because Portuesi in view of Narayan, and further in view of Blackketter fails to disclose or suggest the “remote controller” as recited in claim 13.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claims 14, 15, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi, Narayan, and Blackketter, and further in view of Shaw et al. (USP 6,516,341). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14, 15, and 16, dependent on claim 13, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 13.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claims 3, 5, and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of White (20060010478). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 5, and 7 have been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Application No.: 09/898,014
Reply dated November 1, 2006
to Office Action of August 1, 2006
Page 12 of 12

Docket No.: 0033-0736P

(e) Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of White, and further in view of Blackketter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 has been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Charles Gorenstein, Reg. No. 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant